DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 422 448 UD 032 508

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Shields, Nancy; Pierce, Lois |
| TITLE | Factors Related to Aggressive and Violent Behavior among Preadolescent African-American Boys. |
| PUB DATE | 1997-00-00 |
| NOTE | 21p.; Version of a paper presented at the National Conference on Family and Community Violence (3rd, New Orleans, LA, October 1997). |
| PUB TYPE | Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150) |
| EDRS PRICE | MF01/PC01 Plus Postage. |
| DESCRIPTORS | After School Programs; Age Differences; *Aggression; Behavior Patterns; *Blacks; Family Influence; *Males; *Preadolescents; Program Development; *Student Attitudes; *Violence |
| IDENTIFIERS | African Americans |

ABSTRACT

Drawing on theoretical and empirical studies, this paper hypothesized that attitudes towards the use of violence and the use of aggressive and violent behavior among preadolescent African American males would be affected by verbal aggression in the home, violence observed in the community, family environment, and peer models. Data on aggressive and violent behavior and attitudes among young African American males were available from a larger project designed to improve self-esteem, decision skills, and interpersonal competence, and encourage positive attitudes toward non-European cultures. A data set with ratings from behavior and protective factors was obtained for 152 boys aged 8 to 13. Ratings came from 85 group leaders over 3 project years. A consistent finding from the three analyses performed was that attitudes toward the use of violent and aggressive behavior and actual use of violence and aggressive behavior seems to increase with age, with the effect being stronger for attitudes than actual behavior. One analysis suggested no correspondence in the boys' actual attitudes and behaviors and the way they behaved in the after school groups, suggesting that the use of violent and aggressive behavior is context specific. Ratings by group leaders were not affected by family environment, exposure to violence in the community, peer relationships, or age. Findings from a second analysis strongly support an ecological-developmental perspective, as all factors except positive peer relationships had a highly significant impact on self-control. Family structure improved self-control, family arguments decreased self-control, and exposure to community violence decreased self-control. Peers, exposure to community violence, and family arguments significantly affected the boys' actual use of aggressive and violent behavior. The boys lived in five different areas of the city, suggesting that socialization in any single neighborhood was not responsible. Multivariate analyses reveal that the most important factors affecting self-control were family arguments and age, while the most important factors affecting aggressive and violent behavior were peer relationships and family arguments. The findings suggest that programs designed to reduce violent behavior may be more effective if they include parents. An appendix describes the measures used in the study. (Contains 4 tables and 14 references.) (SLD)

# FACTORS RELATED TO AGGRESSIVE AND VIOLENT BEHAVIOR AMONG PREADOLESCENT AFRICAN-AMERICAN BOYS*

NANCY SHIELDS AND LOIS PIERCE

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI-ST. LOUIS

*An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Third National Conference on Family and Community Violence
New Orleans, LA
October, 1997

## INTRODUCTION

### Violence among African-American male youth

The issue of violence among African-American males has been a growing concern over the past years. For example, Clark (1996) notes that since 1964, about half of all officially recorded violence each year is committed by African-American males, yet they compose only 3% of the population. This trend is also reflected in official murder rates. According to the Federal Bureau of Investigation (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 1994) in 1992, the ratio of African-American male to Caucasian male murders in the age group of 1-14 was 125:98; the ratio was 2,536:1,421 in the age group 15-19; and 2,183:1,373 in the age group 20-24.

Clark (1996) also observes that African-American male offenders are getting younger. Between 1987 and 1991, there was an 85% increase in the number of juveniles arrested for murder and a 50% increase in those arrested for other violent crimes. This is consistent with the 1992 FBI data (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 1994) which shows the highest incidence of murder among African-American males in the 15-19 age group, which was also true for Caucasian males. Clark (1996) attributes the rise in violence to the growth of gangs during this period.

Not only are young African-American males committing violent crime, they (along with other inner-city children) are observing a substantial amount of violence in their communities. In one study, 73% of 8$^{th}$ graders in a Chicago neighborhood had seen someone shot, stabbed, robbed or killed (Clark, 1996). Another study in Washington, D. C. reported that 45% of first and second graders studied had observed a mugging, 31% had seen someone shot, and 39% had seen a dead body in a street.

### A Historical Perspective

Clark (1996) argues that African-American male violence must be understood in relation to the "white" criminal justice system, which has historically granted leniency when the victim is African-American, has condoned the use of violence among African-Americans as a method of resolving disputes, and has led to the rise of the use of violence in African-American communities. The roots of these attitudes can be traced to slavery, when a criminal justice system for African-Americans was non-existent. Clark (1996) argues that violence became a form of "personal law enforcement" among African-Americans in the 1930s, and was the result of a lack of interest of "white" courts in cases that involved African-Americans. According to Clark (1996), several historical events made matters worse: the urban renewal of the 1950s; southern immigration between 1940 and 1970; and the population explosion of young people (baby boomers) who came of age in the 1960s. Nightingale (1993) also relates the rise of violence in the 1960s and 1970s to changes in the economic structure of the African-American family. During this time it became increasingly less likely that fathers would live with their children and provide economic support. In addition, the number of poor families increased (from 25% to 60% between 1959 and 1985). By 1980, only 12% of poor urban African-American women between the ages of 14 and 44 were married.

**A Cultural Perspective**

Clark (1996) suggests that these events, combined with a crowded urban environment and the availability of alcohol and handguns, culminated in a subculture among African-American males that emphasized defending male honor with violence, and was linked to a distrust of "white" law enforcement. He observes an increase in the past 30 years of the number of young African-American males who share these values.

Nightingale (1993), in his field study of inner-city African-American children, observed a subculture of violence based on the beliefs that: it is necessary to respond to violence with retaliation; violence is a legitimate form of "entertainment"; violence is an accepted aspect of sexual relationships; and violence is an important part of the male identity. He emphasizes that these beliefs are all a part of the American mass culture of violence, and that the media increasingly cater to poor, African-American consumers. Nightingale also observed certain child rearing practices that reinforce the use of violence: the use of force to control children; the rejection of "progressive" child rearing among African-American families; the belief that a child will be spoiled with attention and affection; and a lack of positive parent/child interaction.

However, others have warned that popular images of violence are being increasingly associated with young African-American and Latino men, ignoring the broader cultural manifestations of violence in our society (Noguera, 1997). By focusing our attention solely on these groups, we reinforce racial stereotypes and contribute to discrimination. Greenberg and Schneider (1994) make the same point. In their analysis of three medium-sized cities in New Jersey, they show that violent death rates from homicides in marginal areas are high for Caucasians, African-Americans, and Hispanics, as well as for men and women, the young and the old. They conclude that marginalization of unwanted land and unwanted people is actually the cause of urban violence. Thus, interpretations of research findings concerning young African-American males must be made with this background in mind.

**An ecological-developmental perspective**

While all the issues that have been mentioned are important, it is also important to understand how many children, in spite of living in violent communities, develop positive forms of

interaction. Fraser (1996) suggests that aggressive behavior in childhood originates with family processes that lead to social rejection by peers and the use of aggression to achieve goals. The ecological-developmental perspective emphasizes the importance of the opportunity for positive social interaction and the development of social skills that lead to successful experiences with peers and adults. When such opportunities are absent, aggression and violent behavior are likely to become strategies for dealing with the social environment. Family processes that reinforce aggression are inconsistent supervision, harsh punishment, failure to set limits, lack of rewards for non-aggressive behavior, and coercive parenting styles (Patterson, Capaldi, and Bank, 1991). When children do not develop positive modes of interacting with other children, aggressive behavior is more likely. Aggressive behavior that develops during early adolescence is thought to be associated with involvement with illegitimate opportunity structures and association with delinquent peers. Thus, a structured family environment and positive peer models are important to the development of pro-social behavior. Others have noted the importance of parents and peers in forming a child's behavior (Rutter, 1987; Baumrind, 1985).

## STATEMENT OF THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Drawing on these theoretical and empirical studies, we hypothesized that attitudes toward the use of violence, and the use of aggressive and violent behavior among preadolescent African-American males would be affected in the following ways:

(1) the more verbal aggression the child observed in the home, the more aggressive and violent his attitudes and behavior,

(2) the more violence the child observed in his community, the more violent his attitudes and behavior.

(3) the more structured (but not violent) the child's family environment, the less violent his attitudes and behavior, and

(4) the more positive the child's peer models, the less violent and aggressive his behavior and attitudes.

These hypotheses are consistent with the theoretical perspectives that have been presented. The first two hypotheses argue that aggressive and violent attitudes and behavior are learned directly from the social (family and neighborhood) environment. The second two hypotheses are more indirect, and suggest that more structured, positive family environments and positive peer relationships will serve to reduce aggressive and violent behavior and attitudes by providing alternative norms and models.

Finally, we were also interested in how all of these factors might influence an adult observer's ratings of a child's aggressive and violent behavior. We hypothesized that children with lower levels of verbal aggression in the family, more structured family environments, positive peer models, and lower levels of exposure to community violence would be rated as less violent and aggressive by adults.

**RESEARCH METHODS**

Data on aggressive and violent behavior and attitudes among young African-American males ages 8-14 are available to us from a larger project which was funded by the Center for Substance Abuse Prevention, project "Be a Star." The program was designed to improve self-esteem, improve decision-making skills, improve interpersonal competence, and encourage positive attitudes toward African-American and other non-European cultures This component

focuses on after-school groups that are provided by five agencies in the city of St. Louis. The agencies are under the direction of the United Church Neighborhood Houses.

After-school groups (which included girls and boys) met once a week for an hour and a half, and were organized according to age groups. Approximately half of the groups received the specially designed project curriculum and are considered "treatment" groups, while the other half (the "comparison" groups) participated in more traditional activities such as singing, games, and crafts relating to the holidays and seasons. These groups were designed to help participants learn to work cooperatively with each other.

Data pertaining to the research questions were collected over the five years of the project (1992-1997) and are available from two major sources. Based on their observations of the boys in groups, each year group leaders provided at least two ratings of the children's behavior. Of current interest are their ratings of the boys on a measure of "self-control," which is a 4 item measure of aggressive and violent behavior in a particular context (the after-school groups). In addition, the boys completed the Revised Protective Factors Index which includes self-reports of self-control (the mean of 4 similar items); family structure (an additive index of six items); positive peer relationships (the mean of 8 items); a behavioral measure of aggressive and violent behavior (the mean of 4 items); and neighborhood violence (the mean of 2 items). The measure of self-control is more attitudinal, while the aggressive and violent behavior measure is purely behavioral. A detailed description of all of the scales and items can be found in Appendix A.

**Combined Behavior Rating and Protective Factors Data Set**

In order to examine the effects of family characteristics and neighborhood violence on the self-control ratings of the group leaders, it was necessary to identify cases where both a "Behavior

Rating" and a "Protective Factors" measure were available for the same year for a particular boy. In order to standardize the data as much as possible, the first Behavior Rating for a particular year was matched with the Protective Factors Index for each year when it was available. Duplicate measures for particular children were removed by selecting the first complete case for each boy and eliminating any subsequent cases. This procedure was followed in order to standardize the data as much as possible, and to minimize the effects of the program (since program effects are not of current theoretical interest). This procedure produced a data set with data for both the Behavior Ratings and the Protective Factors for 152 boys. The boys ranged in age from 8 to 13; the average age was 10.5. They were in grades 3-7, with a mean grade level of 4.7.

Data were also available on the race and gender of the group leaders making the ratings for the 1994, 1995, and 1996 project years. During this period, 10 ratings were made by African-American women, 22 by African-American men, 41 by Caucasian women, and 12 by Caucasian men (total N = 85). Because all of the children being rated were male and African-American, it was important to determine if leaders' ratings varied by the race or gender of the leader. To determine whether or not the leaders' gender or race biased their ratings of self-control, a two-way analysis of variance was conducted with race and gender of group leaders as the independent variables, and self-control ratings as the dependent variable. Neither race nor gender had a significant effect on group leaders' ratings of self-control. Thus, neither a gender or racial bias was found in the ratings.

## FINDINGS

### Findings from the Combined Data Set

In order to determine the effects of the boys' family environment, peer relationships and exposure to community violence on the perceptions of the group leaders, Pearson correlation coefficients were computed for the relationships between the group leader's self-control rating and: family arguments, family structure, exposure to community violence and positive peer relationships. None of these correlations was significant at a .05 level or better. Correlations between age and these variables were also computed, to see if age of the boys was related to ratings of self-control. Ratings of self-control were not correlated with age, suggesting that group leaders probably made allowances for age when making their ratings.

Surprisingly, a significant correlation was found between condition (treatment or comparison) and the leader's rating of self-control ($r = -.32$; $p = <.001$), but in the opposite direction that one might expect. Leaders were actually more likely to rate boys in comparison conditions as having more self-control. Given this outcome, partial correlation coefficients were computed for the original analysis, controlling for condition. The original relationships were essentially unchanged. It seems possible that the fact that the group leaders were aware of group conditions may have led them to overcompensate in their ratings of treatment conditions.

Correlations were also computed between the leaders' ratings of self-control and the boys self-reports of self-control and self-reports of aggressive and violent behavior. These correlations were very low and not statistically significant, suggesting little correspondence between the way the leaders perceived the boys' behavior and the way the boys perceived themselves.

**The Revised Protective Factors Data Set**

This data set was constructed by selecting the first Protective Factors measure for any particular boy, and eliminating any additional measures thereafter. This procedure produced 207

cases. The boys ranged in age from 8 to 14, the average age was 10.5. They were in grades 3-9, and the average grade level was 4.6.

**Self-Control (Table 1)**

Zero-order Pearson correlation coefficients were computed for the relationships between self-control and: family structure, positive peer relationships, exposure to community violence, family arguments, and age. Using one-tailed tests of significance, highly significant relationships were found for family structure ($r = .14$; $p = .02$); community violence ($r = -.18$; $p = .005$); family arguments ($r = -.28$; $p = .0001$); and age ($r = -.21$; $p = .001$). Boys with more structured families, boys who had been exposed to less community violence, and boys who had been exposed to fewer family arguments reported higher self-control. Older boys reported less self-control. Condition was not related to self-control, and was eliminated from further analysis.

In order to assess the effects of all the variables simultaneously, all of the variables were regressed on self-control. Overall, the regression analysis was highly significant ($df = 5, 194$; $F = 6.391$; $p = .0001$). The effects of age ($p = .006$) and family arguments ($p = .001$) remained highly significant, while the effects of community violence ($p = .081$) and family structure ($p = .108$) decreased somewhat. The reduction in effects appeared to be explained by the relationships between family arguments and family structure ($r = -.11$; $p = .054$) and family arguments and exposure to community violence ($r = .21$; $p = .002$).

**Aggressive and violent behavior (Table 2)**

To test for the effects of family structure, positive peer relationships, exposure to community violence, exposure to family arguments, and age on self-reported aggressive and violent behavior, zero order Pearson correlation coefficients were computed for the relationships

between these variables and the aggressive/violent behavior scale. Using 1-tailed tests of significance, highly significant effects were found for all the variables except family structure. Positive peer relationships were related to less aggressive and violent behavior ($r = -.18$, $p = .005$); exposure to community violence was positively related to aggressive and violent behavior ($r = .16$, $p = .009$); exposure to family arguments was related to higher levels of aggressive and violent behavior ($r = .28$; $p = .0001$); and older boys reported more aggressive and violent behavior ($r = .12$; $p = .039$). Condition was not related to aggressive and violent behavior, and was eliminated from further analysis.

To assess the effects of all of the variables simultaneously, family structure, positive peer relationships, exposure to community violence, family arguments, and age were regressed on aggressive and violent behavior. In combination, the effects of the variables were highly significant ($df = 5, 194$; $F = 5.848$; $p = .0001$). The effects of positive peer relationships ($p = .013$) and family arguments ($p = .001$) remained highly significant, while the effects of exposure to community violence ($p = .095$) and age ($p = .161$) decreased. The reduction of the effect of community violence appears to be due to the correlation between community violence and family arguments ($r = .21$, $p = .002$). The reduction of the effect of age when the other variables are controlled appears to be due to its initial weaker effect.

**DISCUSSION**

A summary of the findings from the three analyses can be found in Tables 3 and 4. A consistent finding from the analyses was that attitudes toward the use of violent and aggressive behavior and actual use of violence and aggressive behavior seems to increase with age, with the

effect being stronger for attitudes than actual behavior. One might argue that violent attitudes and behaviors are encouraged rather than discouraged by the social environment as the boys mature.

The findings from the first analysis are interesting in that they suggest that the use of violent and aggressive behavior is context specific. In other words, there was no correspondence in the boys' actual attitudes and behaviors, and they way they behaved in the after school groups (as rated by the group leaders). Furthermore, ratings were not affected by the family environment, exposure to violence in the community, peer relationships, or age. The boys may have been conforming to the after school group norms, which required an appropriate level of self-control. If we had observed the behavior of the boys in their neighborhoods, we might have found a greater correspondence between aggressive and violent behavior (and attitudes), and the family environment, community violence, peer relationships, and age.

The findings from the second analysis strongly support an ecological-developmental perspective on aggressive and violent behavior among young children and preadolescents. All of the factors except positive peer relationships had a highly significant impact on self-control. Family structure improved self-control, family arguments decreased self-control, and exposure to community violence decreased self-control. Peers, exposure to community violence, and family arguments significantly affected the boys' actual use of aggressive and violent behavior. Finally, because the boys lived in five different areas of the city suggests that the results are not due to the effects of socialization from any single neighborhood.

The multivariate analyses revealed that the most important factors affecting self-control were family arguments and age. The most important factors affecting aggressive and violent behavior were peer relationships and family arguments. Thus, verbal aggression in the family

appears to have a powerful effect on the development of aggressive and violent attitudes and actual behavior. Likewise, the findings suggest that peers may be the next most important influence on the use of aggression and violent behavior.

We strongly suspect that the findings reveal basic developmental processes among children that are not confined to young African-American males. For example, research on family violence has shown that family violence (or non-violence), irrespective of race, tends to be passed on from one generation to the next (Straus and Gelles, 1990). All children are significantly influenced by their families, their peers, and what they observe happening in their communities (Quinn, 1995).

**LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS FOR RESEARCH**

The consistency and strength of the findings from these analyses are impressive. However, the bulk of the findings are based on a single, standardized, self-report instrument (the Revised Protective Factors Index), and are limited by various characteristics of the instrument. For example, our measure of community violence is based on only two items (seeing a fight, seeing someone robbed). A more comprehensive measure would include more and less serious forms of violence, and the additional items would produce a more reliable measure. Furthermore, being a self-report instrument, the Revised Protective Factors Index is subject to social desirability effects. Completing the instrument in the context of an after-school program may make the instrument even more subject to such effects.

This study has demonstrated the importance of the family to the development of aggressive and violent attitudes and behavior. This finding suggests that programs that are designed to reduce violent behavior may be more effective when they include parents. It may also be beneficial

to work with parents specifically on how to incorporate structure into family life, and how to settle arguments without violence or aggression (Hawkins, 1985).

This paper focused solely on the aggressive and violent behavior of preadolescent, African-American males. Our future analyses will turn to a comparative study of aggressive and violent behavior of girls and boys. It will be interested to compare levels of violent behavior, atttiudes, and the impact of family, the community, and peers.

## REFERENCES


Baumrind, D. 1985. "Familial antecedents of adolescent drug use: A developmental perspective," In Jones, C., and R. Battjes (Eds.), *Etiology of Drug Abuse: Implications for Prevention.* National Institute on Drug Abuse Research Monograph. Number 56. DHHS Pub. No(ADM) 85-1355. Washington, DC: Supt. of Docs, US Government Printing Office.

Clark, J. W. 1996. "Black-on-black violence," *Society,* July/August: 46-50.

Federal Bureau of Investigation. 1994. *Supplementary homicide report, 1992.* [Computer file]. Ann Arbor, Mich. Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research.

Fraser, M. W. 1996. "Aggressive behavior in childhood and early adolescence: An ecological-developmental perspective on youth violence." *Social work,* 41(4):347-361.

Greenberg, M. and D. Schneider. 1994. "Violence in American cities: Young black males is the answer, but what was the question?" *Social science medicine:* 39(2): 179-187.

Hawkins, J. D., Lishner, D. and R. Catalano. 1985. "Childhood predictors and the prevention of adolescent substance abuse," In Jones, C., and R. Battjes (Eds.), *Etiology of Drug Abuse: Implications for Prevention.* National Institute on Drug Abuse Research Monograph. Number 56.

DHHS Pub. No(ADM) 85-1355. Washington, DC: Supt. of Docs, US Government Printing Office.

Nightingale, C. H. 1993. *On the Edge: A History of Poor Black Children and Their American Dreams.* Basic Books, New York, New York.

Noguera, P. 1997. "Searching for the causes of youth violence," (3rd in series), *Reducing and Preventing Youth Violence: An Analysis of Causes and an Assessment of Successful Programs.* http://www.inmotionmagagine.com/pedro5.html.

Patterson, G. R., Capaldi, D., & L. Bank. 1991. "An early starter model for predicting delinquency." Pp. 139-168 in D. J. Pepler and K. H. Rubin (Eds.), *The Development and Treatment of Childhood Aggression.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum.

Phillips, J. L. and J. F. Springer. 1995. *The protective factors index.* EMT Associates.

Quinn, W. 1995. "Expanding the focus of intervention: The importance of family/community relations," In Adams, P. and K. Nelson (eds.), *Reinventing human services: Community and family centered practice,* NY: Aldine deGruyter.

Rutter, M. 1987. "Psychosocial resilience and protective mechanisms," *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry,* 57(3): 316-331.

Straus, M. A. and R. J. Gelles. 1990. *Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families.* New Brunswick and London: Transaction Publishers.

## APPENDIX A

## MEASURES

### BEHAVIOR RATING SCALE

Based on numerous existing behavior rating scales, the Behavior Rating Scale was developed to obtain ratings of group leaders of the children on the dimensions of social skills, self-control, responsibility, self-esteem, and decision-making ability. Responses are: 0 (not true as far as you know); 1 (somewhat or sometimes true); and 2 (very true or often true). The individual items of the self-control subscale are:

**Self-Control (reverse scored):**

Physically fights to get what he or she wants -
Gets mad easily -
Yells at others when mad -
Breaks things on purpose -

**REVISED INDIVIDUAL PROTECTIVE FACTORS INDEX**

The "Revised Individual Protective Factors Index" scale is based on the "Individual Protective Factors Index," which was developed by Joel L. Phillips and J. Fred Springer of EMT Associates. The revised index is a self-report measure of: School Bonding; Family Bonding; Pro-social Norms; Self-Concept; Locus of Control; Self-Control; Consequential Decision Making; Positive Outlook; Emotional Awareness; Assertiveness; Confidence; Cooperation; Refusal Skills; and attitudes toward drugs and alcohol. The instrument includes questions about gender, grade level, living arrangements, family and neighborhood environment, peer pressure (positive and negative), and behavior at school.

The subscales and individual items of interest are as follows:

**Self-Control (reverse scored):**

Sometimes you have to physically fight to get what you want. -
I do whatever I feel like doing. -
When I am mad, I yell at people. -
Sometimes I break things on purpose. -

**Family structure index (usually true: yes or no; additive index)**

The rules in our house are clear.
I have a certain time when I have to be home.
I have a regular time and place to do homework.
My parents often do not know where I am. -
When I do something wrong, I don't know what my parents will do. -
I have regular chores to do at home.

**Family arguments (reverse scored; all the time, often, not very often, never):**

Family members argue.

**Peer relationships (reverse scored; of your 4 or 5 closest friends, most, some, none):**

Study hard at school. +
Go to church. +
Smoke cigarettes. -
Try drugs like marijuana or cocaine once in a while. -
Attend the after-school club. +
Drink beer or wine once in a while. -
Like school a lot. +
Get along with their parents really well. +

**Self-reported aggressive/violent behavior (reverse scored; 3 or more times in the last year, once or twice, not at all):**

Purposely damaged other people's property.
Got into a fist fight.
Talked back to a teacher.
Argued with your parents.

**Community violence (reverse scored; all the time, often, not very often, never):**

Someone gets robbed.
You see a fight.

Table 1. The Effects of Family Structure, Positive Peers, Community Violence, Age and Family Arguments on Self-Control

| | MEAN | STD. DEVIATION | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| Self-Control | 2.8442 | .7602 | 207 |
| Family Structure | 4.2892 | 1.1316 | 204 |
| Positive Peer | 1.8892 | .2879 | 206 |
| Community Violence | 2.7840 | .9177 | 206 |
| Age | 10.4853 | 1.1848 | 204 |
| Family Arguments | 2.5222 | 1.1272 | 203 |

| | SELF - CONTROL | SIG. (1-TAILED) | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| Self - Control | 1.000 | . | 207 |
| Family Structure | .140 | .023 | 204 |
| Positive Peer | .034 | .312 | 206 |
| Community Violence | -.178 | .005 | 206 |
| Age | -.207 | .001 | 204 |
| Family Arguments | -.284 | .000 | 203 |

| MODEL | R | R SQUARE | ADJUSTED R SQUARE | STD. ERROR OF THE ESTIMATE |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | .376 | .141 | .119 | .7134 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Family Arguments, Positive Peers, Age, Family Structure, Community Violence

| MODEL | SUM OF SQUARES | DF | MEAN SQUARE | F | SIG. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Regression | 16.262 | 5 | 3.252 | 6.391 | .000 |
| Residual | 98.731 | 194 | .509 | | |
| Total | 114.993 | 199 | | | |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Family Arguments, Positive Peers, Age, Family Structure, Community Violence
b. Dependent Variable: Self-Control

| MODEL | | STANDARDIZED COEFFICIENTS | T | SIG. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | (Constant) | | 5.100 | .000 |
| | Family Structure | .109 | 1.617 | .108 |
| | Positive Peer | .013 | .200 | .841 |
| | Community Violence | -.119 | -1.755 | .081 |
| | AGE | -.185 | -2.766 | .006 |
| | Family Arguments | -.233 | -3.405 | .001 |

a. Dependent Variable: Self-Control

Table 2. The Effects of Family Structure, Positive Peers, Community Violence, Age, and Family Arguments on Aggressive and Violent Behavior

| | MEAN | STD. DEVIATION | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| Aggressive/Violent Behavior | 1.9151 | .6170 | 207 |
| Family Structure | 4.2892 | 1.1316 | 204 |
| Positive Peers | 1.8892 | .2879 | 206 |
| Community Violence | 2.7840 | .9177 | 206 |
| Age | 10.4853 | 1.1848 | 204 |
| Family Arguments | 2.5222 | 1.1272 | 203 |

| | AGGRESSIVE/VIOLENT BEHAVIOR | SIG. (1-TAILED) | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| Aggressive/Violent Behavior | 1.000 | . | 207 |
| Family Structure | .070 | .159 | 204 |
| Positive Peer | -.178 | .005 | 206 |
| Community Violence | .164 | .009 | 206 |
| Age | .124 | .039 | 204 |
| Family Arguments | .282 | .000 | 203 |

| MODEL | R | R SQUARE | ADJUSTED R SQUARE | STD. ERROR OF THE ESTIMATE |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | .362a | .131 | .109 | .5825 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Family Arguments, Positive Peers, Age, Family Structure, Community Violence

| MODEL | | SUM OF SQUARES | DF | MEAN SQUARE | F | SIG. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Regression | 9.922 | 5 | 1.984 | 5.848 | .000 |
| | Residual | 65.829 | 194 | .339 | | |
| | Total | 75.752 | 199 | | | |

| MODEL | | STANDARDIZED COEFFICIENTS | T | SIG. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | (constant) | | 5.410 | .000 |
| | Family Structure | .024 | .349 | .727 |
| | Positive Peer | -.168 | -2.501 | .013 |
| | Community Violence | .115 | 1.680 | .095 |
| | Age | -.095 | -1.407 | .161 |
| | Family Arguments | .244 | 3.535 | .001 |

Table 3. Summary of All Zero-Order Effects

| Independent variables | Dependent Variables: Leaders' ratings of self-control | Dependent Variables: Self-reported self-control | Dependent Variables: Self-reported aggressive/violent behavior |
|---|---|---|---|
| family arguments | no effect | strong negative effect | strong negative effect |
| family structure | no effect | strong positive effect | no effect |
| community violence | no effect | strong negative effect | strong negative effect |
| positive peer | no effect | no effect | strong positive effect |
| age | no effect | strong negative effect | strong negative effect |

Table 4. Summary of Multivariate Analyses

| Independent variables | Dependent Variables: Self-reported self-control | Dependent Variables: Self-reported aggressive/violent behavior |
|---|---|---|
| family arguments | strong negative effect | strong negative effect |
| family structure | weak positive effect | no effect |
| community violence | weak negative effect | weak negative effect |
| positive peer | no effect | strong positive effect |
| age | strong negative effect | weak negative effect |

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

# REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

UD032 508

## I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

| | |
|---|---|
| Title: Factors Related to Aggressive and Violent Behavior Among Preadolescent African-American Boys | |
| Author(s): Nancy Shields and Lois Pierce | |
| Corporate Source: | Publication Date: |

## II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic/optical media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS) or other ERIC vendors. Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following two options and sign at the bottom of the page.

☐ Check here
**For Level 1 Release:**
Permitting reproduction in microfiche (4" x 6" film) or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic or optical) and paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Level 1

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Level 2

☐ Check here
**For Level 2 Release:**
Permitting reproduction in microfiche (4" x 6" film) or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic or optical), but not in paper copy.

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but neither box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

*"I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic/optical media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries."*

Sign here—please

| | |
|---|---|
| Signature: Nancy Shields | Printed Name/Position/Title: Nancy Shields, Ph.D. |
| Organization/Address: UM St. Louis 228 Benton Hall<br>8001 Natural Bridge Rd.<br>St. Louis, MO 63121 | Telephone: 314 516 6805<br>FAX: 314 516 6801<br>E-Mail Address: snmshie@umslvma.umsl.edu<br>Date: 8/13/97 |

(over)

## III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

| |
|---|
| Publisher/Distributor: |
| Address: |
| Price: |

## IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

| |
|---|
| Name: |
| Address: |

## V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

**ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education**
**Box 40, Teachers College**
**Columbia University**
**New York, NY 10027**

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

**ERIC Processing and Reference Facility**
**1100 West Street, 2nd Floor**
**Laurel, Maryland 20707-3598**

**Telephone: 301-497-4080**
**Toll Free: 800-799-3742**
**FAX: 301-953-0263**
**e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov**
**WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com**